VSP Public Comment

From: jnwinter@comcast.net
Sent: Saturday, June 25, 2005 10:10 AM
To: Secretary of State, Constituent Affairs
Cc: McDannold, Bruce
Subject: Standards for AVVPAT

Should Calfornia reject the proposed Diebold system?   Vote=Yes

The integrity of our democratic system and the respect and confidence of the citizens of
this state are in jeopardy. We must take action to secure the accuracy and reliability of
our ballots and the system used for verifying and checking them. We do not want or need
to be another Florida.   I respectfully request you consider the following:
The requirement for an Accessible Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail legislated in September
is being subverted by cynical products such as the Diebold thermal paper continuous roll
miniature type printer, which obviously will not be useful for an actual hand count of
votes. The standards need to be made more specific, to assure that this kind of travesty
is not certified.
Please include in the Standards for Accessible Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail Systems
the following provisions:
Any voting systems approved for use in California after January 1, 2005 shall have a
AVVPAT that conforms to the adopted Standards.
The AVVPAT shall be printed on single sheet non-thermal at least 16 pound paper, one
record of vote per sheet.
Every recorded vote, no matter how recorded, shall have a AVVPAT copy.
The AVVPAT record of the vote shall be printed in a minimum of 12 point font.
The AVVPAT shall be printed and organized to be easily read by both the voter and election
officials.
The AVVPAT during the 1% manual audit and any recount shall be physically verified and
hand counted only.
The recorded vote choices on the AVVPAT shall not be audited or recounted by automatic or
electronic methods.
There shall not be a method by which any particular voting record can be connected to any
particular voter.
Any AVVPAT spoiled or rejected by a voter because of a voting system error shall not be
counted as a spoiled ballot under the two spoiled ballots limit.
No remote access to voting machines by wireless or internet.

DENY CERTIFICATION TO:
1. DIEBOLD GEMS 1.18.22 AV-TSX 4.6.1 Voting System with The Accu View Printer Module 2. E
S and S TABULATORS, Models 100, 550, and 650 3. Any System with Wireless and Internet
Capabilities 4. BAN DIEBOLD From Doing Business in California In order to protect,
preserve and defend the Sanctity of the Vote, I hereby request that State Certification be
denied to the above mentioned voting systems and equipment as they are in violation of the
following; CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION ARTICLE 2 VOTING, INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM, AND RECALL
SECTION 1. All political power is inherent in the people. Government is instituted for
their protection, security, and benefit, and they have the right to alter or reform it
when the public good may require.
SEC. 2.5. A voter who casts a vote in an election in accordance with the laws of this
State shall have that vote counted.
TABULATING SYSTEMS SOFTWARE:
Both the Diebold System and the E S and S Tabulators operate on Proprietary Closed Source
Code Software, their tabulating processes being so secretive and hidden from public
scrutiny and observation as to make the verification and observation process hidden and
non transparent to the Voter. This is antithetical to the very foundation of American
Democracy.
AVVPAT: (Accessible Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail) A voter's ballot is one of the most
important documents which exist in a free society. California voters deserve an AVVPAT
equal in size and layout to a standard ballot, not a gas pump receipt. This size AVVPAT is
actually intentionally constructed so as to create an impediment and discouragement to a
voter's use for verifying their vote. A proper AVVPAT must be constructed so as to ENABLE
the voter to verify their choices, not to discourage a voter to verify their vote. The so

called AVVPAT on the Diebold is so small as to be unreadable to Voters with less than perfect eyesight, making it prejudicial and discriminatory towards voters with a form of eyesight disability. Further, due to its miniscule small size, the Diebold AVVPAT is so small as to make it impossible for the voter to properly review their choices in one continuous viewing. This small size only serves the needs of Diebold, it does not serve the needs of the voters. Also, the paper is Thermal Paper, decreasing !
the shelf life readability, rendering it useless for a meaningful recount and not in compliance for the 22 month mandatory ballot retention laws. The ONLY acceptable and valid AVVPAT is one filled out by the hand of the voter, not a replica or copy of how the machine voted.
WIRELESS and INTERNET CAPABILITIES:
This functionality MUST be denied as it compromises the entire integrity, secrecy, and security of the voting process. Any knowledgeable hacker with a good encryption cracking program can access and corrupt and alter the voting data in a matter of minutes. The E S and S tabulators have a Dell Laptop which contains wireless equipped functionalities.
BAN DIEBOLD FROM DOING BUSINESS IN CALIFORNIA FOR 3 YEARS:
Enforce California Election Code Section 19214.5, Subsection (a) and (3) due to their Criminal Acts of Defrauding 17 California Counties in the sale of Uncertified Software.

Ms. Jennie N. Winter
815A Belmont Ave
Belmont, CA 94002

Citizen Proposed Standards:

The AVVPAT shall be printed on single sheet non-thermal at least 16 pound paper, one record of vote per sheet.

Every recorded vote, no matter how recorded, shall have a AVVPAT copy.

The AVVPAT record of the vote shall be printed in a minimum of 12 point font.

The AVVPAT shall be printed and organized to be easily read by both the voter and election officials.

The AVVPAT during the 1% manual audit and any recount shall be physically verified and hand counted only.

The recorded vote choices on the AVVPAT shall not be audited or recounted by automatic or electronic methods.

There shall not be a method by which any particular voting record can be connected to any particular voter.

Any AVVPAT spoiled or rejected by a voter because of a voting system error shall not be counted as a spoiled ballot under the two spoiled ballots limit.

No remote access to voting machines by wireless or internet.